

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

Education Station

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Lesson matches original description	<i>3 Meets Standards</i>	Criminal Background Checks	<i>Non Compliance</i>
Recruiting Materials	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Instruction is clear	<i>2.5 Between Approaching and Meeting Standard</i>	Health/safety laws & regulations	<i>In Compliance</i>
Academic Program	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Time on task is appropriate	<i>3 Meets Standards</i>	Financial viability	<i>Non Compliance</i>
Progress Reporting	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	<i>2.5 Between Approaching and Meeting Standard</i>		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Student/instructor ratio: 9:1	<i>2 Approaching Standard</i>		

As of the 2008-2009 school year, Education Station will no longer be providing SES programs to Indiana students.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Education Station
REVIEWER: S.T.

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: May 8, 2008

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	BOTH of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications (<u>all tutors</u>) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Tutor evaluations (<u>all tutors</u>) -Recruiting policy for tutors (<u>one copy</u>) -Sample tutor contract (<u>one copy</u>)	-Resumes -Tutor evaluations -Training packet, agenda, and PowerPoint	X		-Training materials offer an introduction to provider's program and also share provider's expectations for instruction and behavior management. Tutors are also required to complete tests after trainings to assess each tutor's knowledge acquisition; -Provider requires tutors to be highly qualified teachers. At least one tutor did not meet provider's minimum tutor qualifications as he/she is not a certified teacher. In addition, provider failed to submit documentation verifying whether 8 other tutors met tutor qualifications; <i>-Although tutor evaluations for all tutors were requested multiple times, provider did not submit requested documentation;</i> <i>-Although training completion documentation for all tutors was requested multiple times, provider did not submit requested documentation.</i>
Recruiting materials	TWO of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	-Recruitment flyers -Recruitment brochures -Reward packet	X		- While some information on recruitment materials is in line with provider's application not all of the information included in recruitment information is completely accurate. For instance, the materials state that tutoring with small group instruction will be provided when, based upon the provider's application and the observed tutoring sessions, large group instruction is also provided (2 of the 4 groups observed were large groups). In addition, the recruitment materials state that students will be tutored by "qualified teachers" when based upon tutor resumes some tutors are not certified teachers.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Academic Program	<p>ONE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors <p>In addition to:</p> <p>ONE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lesson plans -Specific connections to Indiana Academic Standards 		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson plan format matches description in provider application and lessons observed during onsite monitoring visits; -Lesson plans are very detailed and include a welcome activity, lesson objectives, a review of concepts, list of materials that will be needed, prompting questions tutors should ask students, tips for direct instruction, and guided practice and independent practice activities; -Lessons clearly connect to Indiana Academic Standards.
Progress Reporting	<p>ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Progress reports -Timeline for submitting progress reports -SES Agreements -SES Contract 	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -According to one district the provider did not submit progress reports in a timely manner and had to be reminded repeatedly to submit reports. In addition, progress reports at one site were sent once during the program when the providers SES Contract stated parents and the district would receive progress reports monthly; -Progress reports do not include all of IDOE's required components (see memo sent to providers in December 2007). Progress reports do not include specific information regarding how students are improving their academic achievement, student goals, pre and post-test scores, or student strengths or areas in need of improvement. In addition, progress reports for one site were completely different from those at another site in terms of format and also information shared.
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p>ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanation of learning plan development process -Pre-test scores and learning plans -Explanation of assessment's correlation to Indiana Academic Standards 	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Learning plan development process is appropriate, however, Individual learning plans only include a list of standards upon which students will work and student pre-assessment scores. Learning plans do not include specific, measurable goals based on the initial pre-assessment or include specific strategies, materials and resources that will be used to help students achieve those goals; -Content included in Pre and post-test assessments correlate with Indiana academic standards.

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Education Station

SITE: YWCA of Northwest Indiana (1350 Broadway)

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): D.S., W.C., F.N., & D.H.

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 4

DATE: April 22, 2008

REVIEWER: S.T. & K.S.

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:10 p.m.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application			X		<p>-Small and large groups of students were separated by grade level into four different groups working on reading and language arts activities. Two groups of students read narrative passages together under the guidance of their tutors. The tutors asked reading comprehension questions and directed students to work on vocabulary and comprehension exercises in the provider's curriculum workbook once students were finished reading the passage. Another group of students completed an independent practice exercise on reading comprehension while the tutor visited each student to check progress and provide clarification. Still another group of students worked on a letter recognition activity that involved creating an alphabet rainbow;</p> <p>-The observed lessons matched the description in the provider's application. Activities focusing on concepts such as alphabetic knowledge, phonemic awareness, fluency, and vocabulary and comprehension instruction were all integrated in various lessons as described in the application.</p>
Instruction is clear		2.5			<p>-In three of the groups observed, tutors clearly shared expectations and lesson objectives. These tutors effectively used scaffolded instruction and checked for student comprehension before moving on to a new task or concept. Students working with these tutors knew the activities/tasks that they were to accomplish. In addition, these students received immediate guidance and clarification if/when needed.</p> <p>-In a fourth group, which exceeded the acceptable ratio range (see “Student/Instructor ratio” section), the tutor communicated lesson objectives with students, however, the tutor was not able to effectively provide instruction and manage the varying needs (there</p>

					<p>appeared to be multiple ability levels within the group) of so many students all at once. Due to the challenge of balancing the demands of classroom management and instruction with such a large group, the tutor was not always able to adjust or individualize instruction for students who did not understand the lesson. In addition, this challenge in balancing demands also made it difficult for the tutor to provide further instruction and guidance to students who understood the lesson and had finished their independent practice exercises quickly. These students became distracted and sometimes engaged in off task behavior when they were uncertain of the tutor's expectations regarding what activity they should complete next (see "Time on Task" section).</p>
COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Time on task is appropriate			X		<p>-In three of the groups, students were on task and rarely had to be redirected. These students were engaged in their lessons and their tutors used effective means to promote time on task.</p> <p>-In a fourth group, which exceeded the acceptable ratio range (see "Student/Instructor ratio" section), a few students appeared to have difficulty paying attention and staying engaged in their work. During independent practice time, students who had finished their work and were not sure what they should complete next began engaging in off task behavior (i.e. socializing, writing notes, etc.) while the tutor was providing 1:1 direct assistance to other students in need of guidance. The tutor's attempts to redirect these students was initially successful, however, as soon as the tutor's attention was directed elsewhere, the students returned to their off task behavior.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		2.5			<p>-In three of the groups, tutors successfully engaged students in their lessons and effectively promoted time on task. The tutors encouraged students to join in during class participation portions of the lessons and demonstrated effective classroom and behavior management skills. These tutors appropriately modeled the provider's instructional strategies and lesson format as described in the application by providing "targeted, scaffolded instruction, including direct instruction, guided practice, and independent practice". In fact, one tutor was even observed modeling and repeating the provider's "Good Reader Strategies" ("slow down when it gets hard, read it again", etc.) with his/her students during an activity when each student read part of a narrative out loud to the group.</p> <p>-However, a tutor in one of the three groups was not completely prepared to implement his/her lesson. The tutor took time in the middle of each activity during the lesson to pause to read the lesson plan to understand what the students should be instructed to do at every step of the lesson. Once, during the tutor's review of the lesson plan in the middle of an activity, the tutor's distraction with reviewing the lesson plan led him/her to approve an answer a student gave that was actually incorrect.</p>

					<p>-In addition, while the tutor in the fourth group, which exceeded the acceptable ratio range (see “Student/Instructor ratio” section), clearly understood the lesson and appeared knowledgeable about the provider’s instructional strategies, the large group size appeared to hinder the tutor’s ability to effectively demonstrate this knowledge. This tutor was not observed implementing targeted direct instruction or scaffolded instruction as described in the provider’s application. In addition, this tutor had difficulty keeping all students on task and did not always effectively modify instruction for students operating at varying ability levels.</p>
Student/instructor ratio: 9-2:1		X			<p>-The observed ratio in one of the four groups (9:1) exceeded IDOE’s ratio limits and the ratio range that was approved in the provider’s application (6-8:1). In addition, one tutor shared that he/she was challenged at least once a week when his/her student/tutor ratio was 12:1.</p>

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric COMPLIANCE Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Education Station
REVIEWER: S.T.

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: May 8, 2008

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	ALL of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Criminal background checks -Several criminal background checks for tutors were not completed prior to tutors working with students		X
Health and safety laws and regulations	ONE of the following: -Student release policy(ies) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Student release policies -Parent sign-out sheet -Activity/Incident report form -Bus transportation form	X	
Financial viability	ONE of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	-Verification of liability insurance <i>-Although audited financial statements and tax returns were requested, provider did not submit requested documentation.</i>		X